



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,915	01/14/2002	Abraham Ronai	U400	3107

7590 12/17/2004
Abraham Ronai
253-16 80th Ave.
Glen Oaks, NY 11004

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

10/045,915

Applicant(s)

RONAI, ABRAHAM

Examin r

Kristina B. Honeycutt

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/14/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed January 14, 2002 with acknowledged provisional application filing dates February 2, 2001 and March 9, 2001; I.D.S. filed January 14, 2002.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 13 and 14 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81. No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing.

Specification

Claim Objections

4. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 3 states "...by adding one or identifier..." and for purposes of examination is understood to mean "...by adding one or more identifier...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claim 4 recites the limitation "the history" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 5 recites the limitations "the last" and "the same" in line 4 and "the most" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Claim 10 is rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claim 11 recites the limitations "the first" and "the last" in line 3 and "the same" and "the most" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Claim 12 is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hachamovitch et al. (U.S. Patent 6377965).

Regarding independent claim 13, Hachamovitch discloses:

- an assistance device for assisting the drafting of documents on a word processor having an input device and a display (col. 4, lines 10-13; col. 9, lines 7-15, 48-52 – as demonstrated in the cited text, an “assistance device” for use with a word processor, input device and display is disclosed);
- said assistance device comprising a recognition means and an autocomplete means (col. 4, lines 55-64; col. 5, lines 7-10 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the “assistance device” has a “recognition” means and an autocomplete means);
- said recognition means scanning each symbol as it is being inputted via the input device and placing all words longer than a predetermined number into an autocomplete list (col. 6, lines 45-52; col. 7, lines 18-36; col. 10, lines 64-67; col. 11, lines 1-3; col. 16, lines 47-50 – as demonstrated in the cited text, “recognition” means scans each input and places all words longer than a predetermined number into an “autocomplete list”);
- said autocomplete means scanning each symbol as it is being inputted via the input device and automatically completing via the display or offering the option to automatically complete all partial words inputted that match words in the autocomplete list at least by a predetermined number of letters (Figure 5; col. 6, lines 61-67; col. 7, lines 1-11; col. 10, lines 24-42; col. 14, lines 55-61, 66-67; col. 15, lines 1-3 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, autocomplete means scans each input and offers the option to complete all partial words inputted that

Art Unit: 2178

match words in the autocomplete list at least by a predetermined number of letters).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachamovitch et al. (U.S. Patent 6377965) in view of MightyMacro™ Patent Helper™, <<http://web.archive.org/web/20010405014234/www.patentseminars.com/main.asp?mainpage=Softwaredescriptionsbody.asp&navigation=descripmenu.asp&menu=Software>>, herein referred to as MightyMacro.

Regarding independent claim 1, Hachamovitch discloses a word processor having an input device (col. 9, lines 7-13).

Hachamovitch further discloses an assistance device comprising a recognition means and an autocomplete means (col. 4, lines 55-64; col. 5, lines 7-10).

Hachamovitch further discloses said autocomplete means scans each symbol as it is being inputted via the input device and compares these symbols to those in the part names already added to the autocomplete list by the recognition means (Figure 5; col. 10, lines 24-42; col. 14, lines 66-67; col. 15, lines 1-3).

Hachamovitch further discloses as soon as a predetermined number of consecutive symbols of a name in the autocomplete list are inputted via the input device the autocomplete means offers the option to a user to finish typing the name (col. 6, lines 61-67; col. 7, lines 1-11; col. 10, lines 31-37; col. 14, lines 55-61).

Hachamovitch discloses an assistance device for assisting the drafting of documents on a word processor (col. 4, lines 10-13; col. 9, lines 48-52) but does not disclose the documents including part names and related reference numbers. MightyMacro teaches documents with part names and reference numbers (Specific Features, para. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hachamovitch and MightyMacro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the assistance device taught by Hachamovitch to include documents with names and reference numbers as taught by MightyMacro, because extending the device to drafting various types of documents, including documents like patent applications that contain names and numbers, would increase the device's usability since users with differing needs would benefit by being able to draft the specific type of document pertaining to their needs.

Hachamovitch discloses said recognition means scans each symbol inputted via the input device and places all words into an autocomplete list (col. 6, lines 45-52; col.

Art Unit: 2178

7, lines 18-36; col. 10, lines 24-31, 64-67; col. 11, lines 1-3) but does not disclose the list contains words followed by a first space followed by a number. MightyMacro teaches a list contains words followed by a number (Specific Features, para. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hachamovitch and MightyMacro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the list taught by Hachamovitch to include words followed by a number as taught by MightyMacro, because including word and number pairs in the list would increase the device's usability since users would be able to utilize autocomplete functions when drafting documents with repeating name and number relationships.

Regarding independent claims 6 and 14, the claims reflect the method and computer program product corresponding to the assistance device of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Hachamovitch discloses recognizing the next character as a space, period or comma (col. 16, lines 8-22) but does not disclose placing words followed by a number followed by a space, period or comma in the autocomplete list. MightyMacro teaches a list contains words followed by a number (Specific Features, para. 4) and it is obvious that the number could be followed by another delimiting character, such as a space, period or comma. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hachamovitch and MightyMacro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the list taught by

Art Unit: 2178

Hachamovitch to include words followed by a number followed by a space, period or comma as taught by MightyMacro, because including word and number pairs along with delimiting characters would increase the device's usability since users would be able to utilize autocomplete functions when drafting documents with repeating name and number relationships found anywhere within sentences in the document.

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, the claims reflect the method corresponding to the assistance device of claims 2 and 3 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Hachamovitch discloses placing words in an autocomplete list (col. 10, lines 64-67; col. 11, lines 1-3) but does not disclose placing words followed by a number in the autocomplete list with the word being considered the part name and the number its associated part number. MightyMacro teaches placing part names followed by the associated part number in the autocomplete list (Specific Features, para. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hachamovitch and MightyMacro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the list taught by Hachamovitch to include part names followed by the associated part number as taught by MightyMacro, because including part name and associated part number pairs would extend the device to drafting various types of documents, including documents like patent applications that contain part names and numbers, which would increase the device's usability since users with differing needs

Art Unit: 2178

would benefit by being able to draft the specific type of document pertaining to their needs.

10. Claims 4, 5 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachamovitch et al. (U.S. Patent 6377965) in view of MightyMacro™ Patent Helper™,

<<http://web.archive.org/web/20010405014234/www.patentseminars.com/main.asp?mainpage=Softwaredescriptionsbody.asp&navigation=descripmenu.asp&menu=Software>>, herein referred to as MightyMacro, in further view of Robinson (U.S. Patent 5983180).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Hachamovitch does not disclose prior to automatically finishing the part name and reference number already on the autocomplete list the recognition means in certain circumstances extends the part name by adding one or more identifiers before it, the determination as to whether to add identifiers being based on the history of use said identifiers immediately before part names earlier in the document. Robinson teaches extending words by adding identifiers based on word history (Figure 18; col. 14, lines 1-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hachamovitch and Robinson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the assistance device taught by Hachamovitch to include extending words by adding identifiers as taught by Robinson, because extending words in the autocomplete list to include word sequences previously used would enhance the device's usability since the user would be able to use the

autocomplete function to complete word phrases instead of using the function to only complete single words, which would increase productivity by saving the user time and effort when drafting documents.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 10-12, the claims reflect the assistance device and method for extending part names in the autocomplete list as in claim 4 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Method and apparatus for suggesting completions for a partially entered data item based on previously-entered, associated data items (U.S. Patent 5845300),
- Text selection from images of documents using auto-completion (U.S. Patent 6766069).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2178


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER